



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,597	10/30/2003	Ruxandra Draghia-Akli	AVS1-0027 (108328.00161)	7762
70225	7590	05/02/2008		EXAMINER
JACKSON WALKER LLP 901 MAIN STREET SUITE 6000 DALLAS, TX 75202				MARVICH, MARIA
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/02/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/699,597	Applicant(s) DRAGHIA-AKLI ET AL.
	Examiner MARIA B. MARVICH	Art Unit 1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-38 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application and subject to restriction.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a cardiac specific-synthetic promoter, classified in class 536, subclass 24.1.
- II. Claims 9-18 and 29-38, drawn to a method of using a cardiac specific-synthetic expression construct for expressing a gene in a cardiac cell, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
- III. Claims 19-28, drawn to a method of making a cardiac specific-synthetic expression construct for expressing a gene in a cardiac cell, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct each from the other because of the following reasons:

Groups I-III read on a cardiac specific synthetic promoter selected from a group of 8 patentably distinct polynucleotide sequences comprising one of unrelated SEQ ID NOs: 5 and 16-22. As well, Groups I-III read on a cis-acting regulatory elements from a group of unrelated SEQ ID NO:s 1-4. Finally, Groups I-III read on an expression construct selected from the group of unrelated SEQ ID NO:s 7-15. These sequences are unrelated because they are structurally distinct and therefore functionally. Applicants' must select a product of a single polynucleotide sequence as regards SEQ ID numbers 5 and 16-22, a regards 1-4 and s

regards 7-15. *This is not a species election requirement.* See Examination of Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequences, 1192 O.G. 68 (November 19, 1996) e.g.

Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, select to a restriction requirements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 1121 and CFR 1.141 et seq. Nevertheless, to further aid the biotechnology industry to protecting its intellectual property without creating an undue burden on the Office, the Commissioner has decided *sua sponte* to partially waive the requirements of 37 CFR 1.141 et seq. and permit a reasonable number of such nucleotide sequences to be claimed in a single application.

It has been decided that, due to the high burden placed on the Office to search sequences, ONE sequence constitutes a reasonable number for examination purposes. Applicant is required to elect ONE independent and distinct sequence. Examination will be restricted to only the one elected sequence. The search of no more than one selected sequences may include the complements of the selected sequence and where appropriate, may include subsequences within the selected sequence (i.e. oligomeric probes and/or primers).

Inventions II and III are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions

as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the methods have distinct modes of operation. Group II is drawn to a method of using a cardiac synthetic promoter, which uses method steps and materials that are not required of Group III such as deliverance of the cardiac specific synthetic expression unit into a cell. The method of Group III is drawn to a method of synthesizing a cardiac specific synthetic promoter, which uses method steps and materials that are not required of Group II such as operatively linking a cardiac specific synthetic promoter to a *cis*-acting regulatory element and an expressible gene.

Furthermore, the distinct steps and products require separate and distinct searches. A search for art pertaining to methods of using a cardiac specific-synthetic promoter is distinct from a search for art pertaining to methods of making a cardiac specific-synthetic promoter. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Groups II and III together.

Inventions of Group II and either Groups I or III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the methods of Group II do not require the promoters of Group I rather an inducible promoter or a commercially available cardiac specific promoter can be used to mediate gene expression. As well, the methods of Group III do not require the promoters of Group I rather an inducible promoter or a

commercially available cardiac specific promoter can be used to generate the gene expression system .

Searching the inventions of either Groups I and III and Group II together would impose serious search burden. The inventions of Groups I and III and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Moreover, in the instant case, the search for the promoters and the method of using a promoter are not coextensive. Prior art, which teaches a promoter would not necessarily be applicable to the method of using the promoter. Moreover, even if the product were known, the method of using the product may be novel and unobvious in view of the preamble or active steps.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search required for each group is not required for the other groups because each group requires a different non-patent literature search due to each group comprising different products and/or method steps, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provision of MPEP 821.04. Process claims that depend for or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable produce will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or

allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendment submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirements for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 USC 101, 101, 103 and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claim in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 USC 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 USC 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARIA B. MARVICH whose telephone number is (571)272-0774. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach, PhD can be reached on (571)-272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Maria B Marvich, PhD
Examiner

Art Unit 1633

/Maria B Marvich, PhD/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633